

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 57th LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

Call to Order: By **CHAIRMAN BILL THOMAS**, on January 8, 2001 at
3:00 P.M., in Room 472 Capitol.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Bill Thomas, Chairman (R)
Rep. Roy Brown, Vice Chairman (R)
Rep. Trudi Schmidt, Vice Chairman (D)
Rep. Tom Dell (D)
Rep. John Esp (R)
Rep. Tom Facey (D)
Rep. Daniel Fuchs (R)
Rep. Dennis Himmelberger (R)
Rep. Larry Jent (D)
Rep. Michelle Lee (D)
Rep. Brad Newman (D)
Rep. Mark Noennig (R)
Rep. Holly Raser (D)
Rep. Diane Rice (R)
Rep. Rick Ripley (R)
Rep. Clarice Schrupf (R)
Rep. Jim Shockley (R)
Rep. James Whitaker (R)

Members Excused: None.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: David Niss, Legislative Branch
Pati O'Reilly, Committee Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and
discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing(s) & Date(s) Posted: HB 81, HB 79; 1/5/2001

HEARING ON HB 81

Sponsor: REP. JOAN ANDERSEN, HD 23, Fromberg

Proponents: Fred Anderson, Principal, Custer County District High
School

Katie Yother, Student Body Pres., CCDHS, Miles City
Matt Gibbons, CCDHS, Miles City
Joe Barbero, Supt. of Schools, Pryor
Rep. Frank Smith, HD 98, Poplar
Stacia Gerrells, Bridger

Opponents: Lance Melton, Exec. Dir., Mt. School Boards' Assn.
Mike Fellows, Mt. Libertarian Party Chairman
Inga Nelson, MEA-MFT
Scott Crichton, Exec. Dir., ACLU of Mt.

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

REP. JOAN ANDERSEN, HD 23, Fromberg, said that her bill addresses the issue of mandatory drug testing for students in grades 6 through 12 participating in extracurricular activities. She presented an amendment deleting the reference to tobacco in the bill. She did not sign the fiscal note for the bill, because she felt that the costs were greatly inflated and there are places where the tests could be done much more reasonably than the projected \$50 per test. She is estimating \$10 per test with a total cost, including OPI training and training for school district employees, of \$562,400 per year. If the drug testing costs remain stable and enrollments continue to decline, that cost would be less as years go by, until we started seeing an increase in enrollments. That is assuming that all schools in Montana would be doing the testing, which is what we're asking. It is the high school students that know who is using drugs or alcohol; often the teachers are not aware of which ones they are and can't identify them. If there is a statewide criteria for what happens if a student tests positive, and exclusion from extracurricular activity is the same for all high school students, we're making it fair. Many schools have their district policies but they differ from one district to another, and sometimes they are enforced and sometimes they are not. It's important to have a policy throughout the state that is the same for all high school and junior high students. **EXHIBIT(huh05a01)**
EXHIBIT(huh05a02). {Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 1 - 9.3}

Proponents' Testimony:

Fred Anderson, Custer County District High School Principal, Miles City, said that possession and consumption of controlled substances by students is a problem in our schools and communities. The philosophy of the current juvenile justice statutes regarding substance abuse contributes to the problem. Section 45-9-102, subsection 6, allows deferred imposition of sentence for the first offense of persons under age 21. There is a lack of responsibility and accountability in terms of choices regarding possession and

consumption of controlled substances. This bill will not eliminate the use of such substances but will act as a positive deterrent. Over 50 percent of Montana's high school and middle school students participate in extracurricular activities. Being able to provide this standard for the students is going to act as a positive deterrent and allow them to be positive role models for their peers. The doctrine of *in loco parentis* places school officials in the position of acting in place of parents in a manner consistent with that of a responsible, reasonable parent. He believes that such a parent would be opposed to the use of controlled substances. The role of the school is to offer a safe atmosphere, conducive to positive educational experiences and personal wellness for the students. This bill would provide an opportunity to further enhance communications with parents or guardians jointly seeking the best solutions for students.

Katie Yother, Student Body President, CCDHS, Miles City, said that she knows personally about making poor life choices and the need for deterrents from substance abuse. She now makes positive choices. Mandating drug tests would give those involved in activities a reason to say no and would cut substance abuse. If the education system showed that it cared, the students would begin to care more about being involved in making good choices in their lives. This bill would be a type of deterrent.

Matt Gibbons, CCDHS, Miles City, said he is a sophomore and has never used or even been pressured to use drugs. He values many of the activities at CCDHS, especially music, speech and drama, and believes that many of the students at CCDHS would share his opinion that they value their activities more than drugs. They want to be there, they have fun in those activities, and they get something out of the activities. If this bill is passed, at any given time they could be tested and could get yanked out of those activities. It could be a good way to slow down the number of students who take up drugs and become users.

Joe Barbero, Supt. of Schools, Pryor, said they have had a drug testing program in their school district for five years, and it has become an integral part of their school environment. Students know what is expected of them and they know not to do drugs. Alcohol is more difficult to try to manage. The drug testing policy is very effective for drugs. We have to provide our children with another opportunity to say no. In our day and age, drugs are a lot more prevalent in our schools and communities than they were when we were children ourselves. It is important that we send a message to the children of Montana that we're not going to allow this stuff to go on and on, and we need to take another option away from them. He believes that drug testing is very effective. They also provide

counseling services for the students as well as other ways to help them.

Rep. Frank Smith, HD 98, Poplar, supports the bill. The Poplar school district has a reasonable suspicion clause in their policy and procedures. They've been having hearings since last summer on their drug testing policy.

Stacia Gerrells, Bridger, had information from the Hardin Supt. of Schools regarding their drug policy. At the beginning of the year, when students sign up for extracurricular activities, the parents and the student must sign a statement agreeing to the drug testing. The schools do the testing during the first two to three weeks of the school year, then do random testing during the rest of the year. **EXHIBIT(huh05a03) {Tape : 1; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 10.1 - 28.3}**

Opponents' Testimony:

Lance Melton, Exec. Dir., Mt. School Boards' Assn., presented written testimony and said this is an unusual situation for his association, because some school districts implement and support these programs, and others don't believe it's necessary. The bill has some technical problems as it is written, and he is concerned about a constitutional challenge unless it is amended. It is up in the air as to what the fiscal impact is. There is nothing in the fiscal note to address the related programs that might have to be implemented to help kids through counseling. These programs cost money, and it's more than the \$7.50 a test. It's the fallout that's necessary once you identify a positive and litigate your way to establishing that it is, in fact, a positive. Another problem with the bill is the fiscal provision in section 1, subsection 2, that states "for each year in which funds are appropriated by the legislature, the testing program would be mandated." It does not say "full funding," so, for example, the legislature could appropriate \$5,000 on a statewide basis, come one, come all. It doesn't say that this won't be imposed unless there is full funding, and it needs to say that. He believes it is the sponsor's intention that it say that. **EXHIBIT(huh05a04)**

Mike Fellows, Mt. Libertarian Party Chairman, said they oppose the bill. He quoted a student who had said he didn't want to attend a school district where he is guilty until proven innocent. That isn't the way this country works. Fourth amendment concerns over unreasonable searches are valid. Let's ask ourselves what liberty stands for. What liberty means would be offended every time students are asked to provide a urine specimen without any cause that they're using drugs. We need more people volunteering for good groups like Key Club; let's not drive the people we're trying to help underground. It'd be nice if government schools taught

students about the Fourth Amendment, which guarantees the right to be free from unreasonable searches. We need more voluntary programs with incentives that will help solve these local problems that arise. **EXHIBIT (huh05a07)**

Inga Nelson, MEA-MFT, said they have a number of questions and concerns around this bill, including the fiscal impact during a time of tight budgets and limited money for education. They aren't so sure that this is the most appropriate and necessary way to spend this money. Currently school districts have the ability to test students if they see fit. If school districts see this as a problem in their district, they can implement drug testing programs. If they don't, then there is no reason for them to be mandated to do so. Treating teenagers as if they had done something wrong is not necessarily the best way to get them to stay away from something. Students are intelligent enough to figure out that if they are using drugs and they know there will be a drug test coming up when they begin their extracurricular activities, they'll stay away from drugs for a couple of weeks. The random testing after that won't catch a lot of kids and will cost a lot of money.

Scott Crichton, Exec. Dir., American Civil Liberties Union of Mt., said that their mission is to advocate, preserve and defend civil rights and civil liberties in Montana. He doesn't think that much empirical data has been presented upon which the committee can base a change in state law. Anecdotal information from students is interesting, but hardly anything upon which to base a new state law and new state policy, especially one that is so contrary to the basic tenets of liberty that we teach in our school civics classes. He asked the committee to consider some key constitutional provisions when evaluating the merits of this bill, including the Fourth Amendment, prohibiting searches and seizures, and Section 11 of the Declaration of Rights. **EXHIBIT (huh05a05) EXHIBIT (huh05a06)**
{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 0.1 - 15.3}

Informational Testimony: None

Questions from Committee Members and Responses:

Rep. Shockley asked if schools do this now. **Rep. Andersen** said schools have policies within their student handbooks that address this, and they can do this now. **Rep. Shockley** asked if the sponsor had asked any attorneys about the constitutionality of the bill. **Rep. Andersen** asked **Supt. Barbero** to respond, and he said that the U.S. Supreme Court allows drug testing, and it is up to the local educational authorities.

Rep. Ripley asked if the sponsor had based the figures in the fiscal note on extracurricular activities or strictly athletics.

Rep. Andersen said she had used extracurricular activities, and had used the figures that the Budget Office had received from OPI, using 50% of the total number of students in grades 6 through 12.

Rep. Ripley asked if it is legal for school districts to have drug testing policies in place right now, and some school districts do, why pass a law requiring all school districts to do so, and why not leave it up to the local districts for local control. **Rep. Andersen** said that some districts have slightly different policies and slightly different consequences. Sometimes they're enforced and sometimes they aren't. She feels that a policy like this should be fair to all students that are participating in extracurricular activities. **Rep. Ripley** asked if this referred only to public school students or to all students participating in extracurricular activities. **Rep. Andersen** just included public schools.

Rep. Facey asked about the fiscal note. **Rep. Thomas** said it was unsigned by the sponsor so the committee wouldn't get it. **Rep. Facey** said the bill also deals with alcohol, and he asked **Mr. Barbero** about his comment that he didn't feel they were successful in his district dealing with alcohol. **Mr. Barbero** said he does have kids that test for alcohol. When he tests for drugs, it's five major drugs, and his weekly random testing is based on tests on two items. He understands that they have to have permission to test for drugs, but just have to have a suspicion to test for alcohol, so they can test for alcohol at any time. It's more commonly used than drugs and easier to detect. Testing kits are from \$1.50 to \$6.50 apiece, depending on whether they are alcohol swabs or breathalyzer tests.

Rep. Esp asked **Mr. Barbero** how many students are involved in his testing program and what is the cost. He said for the last three years they've tested approximately 393 students, 300 on the initial tests and 93 on the random tests. About six of these tested initially for marijuana, and no other drugs were detected. On the random tests, there were five for marijuana and no other drugs were detected. They don't have a problem with hard drugs in their district. Marijuana is probably the drug of choice, because it's easier to get than any other drug. The cost of their program has been around \$10,000 a year.

Rep. Lee asked **Mr. Barbero** if students who are going into the extracurricular activities and are advised of the drug testing policy sign a waiver of rights. He said they do. **Rep. Lee** asked if they define "reasonable suspicion." **Mr. Barbero** said it's a policy statement, and he read it to the committee.

Rep. Newman asked **Mr. Barbero** if there were provisions in their program to test coaches or other adult monitors of the extracurricular programs, and he responded they were told that was

essentially illegal to do. Bus drivers are tested automatically. Teachers are usually protected by unions. Board policy could require that coaches be tested, but they haven't done that. **{Tape : 1; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 15.6 - 30.2}**

Rep. Newman asked the sponsor if she had considered including coaches and other adult volunteers or monitors in the legislation, and if so, why they are not included. **Rep. Andersen** said they didn't consider adults since the issue brought to them was concerning student use.

Rep. Raser asked the sponsor why tobacco had been stricken from the substances to be tested. **Rep. Andersen** said she had been informed that the tobacco test is more difficult because a student can test positive from second-hand smoke, so there would be greater opportunity for false positives. **Rep. Raser** asked about the reliability of the other drug tests, and **Rep. Andersen** said she was advised that it is very good with very few false positives.

Rep. Lee asked if the state would be responsible for paying for the drug tests, and **Rep. Andersen** answered that she would not carry the bill if it were an unfunded mandate on the school districts. Her costs are based on a lesser amount than the actual costs experienced by Mr. Barbero, and students in several activities would only be tested at the beginning of their first extracurricular activity, not in each subsequent activity, which cuts down on the cost.

Rep. Jent asked why local school boards shouldn't be allowed to make this decision. **Rep. Andersen** said some have made this decision, but she thinks it should be a state mandate because it is a cost to the school districts and some cannot afford it, and she thinks it must be done equally and fairly throughout the state since local district policies vary. **Rep. Schmidt** asked if the cost estimate was \$562,000 per year. **Rep. Andersen** said that is correct, based on information received from the Budget Office and OPI.

Rep. Himmelberger asked **Mr. Barbero** what the scenario is if a student tests positive for a substance. Results of the initial test are sent to Spokane, Wa., and they call him if someone tests positive. He then brings the student to his office. The policy requires that the student talk with the doctor in the lab in Spokane. The student's parent is notified and brought to the school, and they jointly decide on the course of action, which includes some type of drug and alcohol counseling. The cost is paid by the school district. The counseling can be lengthy if a child has ongoing problems, but usually six or seven appointments are all that are needed. He has never had a student request drug counseling voluntarily without having had a positive test for drugs.

Rep. Lee asked how you distinguish between "reasonable suspicion" and "probable cause." **Mr. Barbero** said it is simple in his school district, as anyone who wants to participate in athletics or extracurricular activities must take a drug test. **Rep. Lee** asked how that is reasonable suspicion. He said they don't suspect anybody, they just automatically do the testing. **Rep. Jent** asked **Mr. Barbero** if in his district they don't test students on either reasonable suspicion or probable cause, they just test everybody who is participating in extracurricular activities, and he said that is correct.

Rep. Himmelberger asked the sponsor if she thought about what would occur if a drug test came back positive. **Rep. Andersen** said the bill spells out that if that happened, the student has the right to ask for a second test. If that test is negative, the school district pays for it; if it is positive, the student and family pay for it, and the student would be excluded from competition for two weeks but could participate in practices. If a student tests positive a second time, during the random testing, they are excluded from extracurricular activities for a year. **Rep. Himmelberger** asked if there had been any thought about treatment for students who had tested positive. **Rep. Andersen** said this was not included in the bill, but she does think it is important.

Rep. Thomas asked if this would infringe upon the traditional role of the Mt. High School Activities Assn.'s policy. **Rep. Andersen** was not aware of any infringement. **Rep. Thomas** asked if a school had a more severe form of punishment than what the bill requires, would it undermine the authority of the school. **Rep. Andersen** said she thought it was a fairness issue, and students should be treated equally throughout the state. {Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 0 - 16.7}

Closing by Sponsor:

Rep. Andersen thanked the committee for a really good hearing and for their questions and said that she is glad there is so much interest in this bill, because this is a very important issue. Extracurricular activities are a choice that a student makes. Students are guaranteed a safe and healthful environment when they go to school, and it's up to the people who are in charge of our school districts to see that that happens. She feels that this is a tool to help make that happen, and it's a tool to help students to make a decision whether or not they want to experiment. She would appreciate a positive vote on this bill. {Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 16.7 - 19.2}

HEARING ON HB 79

Sponsor: REP. BILL THOMAS, HD 93, Hobson

Proponents: Roy Kemp, Licensing Bureau Chief, Quality Assurance
Division, DPHHS
Linda Sandman, Mt. Health Care Association
Ray Hoffman, Peak Medical Corp. of Montana
Betty Beverly, Exec. Dir., Mt. Sr. Citizens' Assn.
John Flink, MHA

Opponents: None

Opening Statement by Sponsor:

REP. BILL THOMAS, HD 93, Hobson, was asked by the Dept. of Health to sponsor this legislation, because it would provide a consistent standard for the minimum qualifications of administrators of personal care facilities. This is presently not required by statute. The language in the bill was developed by the Licensing Bureau in response to the disparity of administrator qualifications found in personal care facilities. {Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 19.5 - 20.8}

Proponents' Testimony:

Roy Kemp, Licensing Bureau Chief, Quality Assurance Division, DPHHS, said the legislation is intended to establish minimum requirements to qualify as an administrator of a personal care facility under state law. It is not requesting new rule-making authority but seeks to clarify existing authority. Personal care in Montana is the fastest growing assisted living service in the state. Currently there are 143 facilities representing 3,000 beds. Presently, in rule, a personal care administrator must be at least 18 years of age, with either a high school diploma or a GED. There is a broad distinction in the level of sophistication and educational backgrounds of owners and operators of personal care facilities, leading to a variety of different approaches to assisted living with some inconsistency in the provision of resident services by providers. This legislation will assist the department in assuring that adequate care is delivered in these facilities by standardizing the minimum qualifications of administrators. **EXHIBIT** (huh05a08)

Linda Sandman, Mt. Health Care Association, is the owner of Son Heaven Assisted Living in Helena. She said that the association has no opposition to this bill and anticipates working closely with DPHHS during the administrative rule-making process.

Ray Hoffman, Peak Medical Corp. of Montana, said Peak currently has four long-term care facilities in Montana and is in the process of building a 70-unit assisted living program in Great Falls. They agree with this proposed legislation. His past experience prior to becoming a nursing home administrator probably did not adequately prepare him for what he got into, and he thinks that more requirements to assure the protection of our elderly would be welcomed.

Betty Beverly, Exec. Dir., Mt. Sr. Citizens' Assn., said they support this bill as many of their members and family members are concerned about long-term care and personal care, and they want more services in place.

John Flink, MHA, represents hospital and nursing homes, and they have 22 assisted living facility members in their membership. They support this bill and look forward to working with the department to develop the regulations to implement it. {Tape : 2; Side : A; Approx. Time Counter : 20.8 - 27.9}

Opponents' and Informational Testimony: None

Questions from Committee Members and Responses:

Rep. Noennig asked **Mr. Kemp** why it was necessary to specify the authority and why this bill is necessary. Were people not meeting the current standards as stated in rule, or did they not want to increase the standards in rule without statutory authorization? **Mr. Kemp** said when the legislation was passed in 1993, the statement of intent indicated that the standards would be adopted in only the basic aspects of care that were not already part of local ordinances. In many instances, facilities in which residents would live are the homes of the individuals who are operating them. In 1993, there were only 40 facilities. Assisted living and the complexities of taking care of elderly people has its advantages to being as flexible as possible. The public is demanding of those types of flexibility. He felt that statutory authority is being revisited to simply indicate that administrators should be on an even playing field.

Rep. Noennig said that on page 1, line 16 of the bill it has to do with residents who are 18 years of age or older, and that doesn't relate to administrators. **Mr. Kemp** said the requirement that administrators must be at least 18 and have a GED is found in administrative rule. **Rep. Noennig** said that is why he is confused and wondered why they don't just change the rule. **Mr. Kemp** said he felt there would be opposition to changing the rules and that he thought the legislature would agree that additional requirements are needed. Since the administrative rule process is open to the

public, sometimes it can be very contentious. **Rep. Noennig** asked what type of opposition he would have anticipated if this had been put into rule. **Mr. Kemp** said he couldn't answer that. **Rep. Noennig** wondered if the requirements were increased if it would eliminate some of the people who normally would take these positions, and it might increase the requirement for the salaries of people who are the administrators, thus increasing the costs. He wondered if these impacts are foreseeable and might be a problem. **Mr. Kemp** said the cost would be approximately \$265 to \$365 additional fees to the facility. They are trying to address the issue that many of the owners also serve as the administrators of the personal care facilities. Many of those people looked at the facilities as an investment and a good business. He thinks there are basic requirements that anyone in this field ought to be familiar with before they make decisions affecting the care of individuals in their care.

Rep. Dell asked if the department would be absorbing any costs of this or if there would be additional funding requirements. **Mr. Kemp** said the department did not intend to absorb the costs of this. **Rep. Dell** asked the sponsor if there is a fiscal note. **Rep. Thomas** said there is not.

Rep. Schmidt asked **Mr. Hoffman** to respond to the concerns expressed by **Rep. Noennig**. **Mr. Hoffman** said he understood the question to be why there is a need for this. An administrator of a long-term care facility has to meet many requirements, both state and federal. When assisted living came about a few years ago, it was looked at as a least-costly and a lower level of services from long-term care sites. As the system has started to provide services to folks who meet the same requirements as persons going into nursing homes, it is time to look at the persons who are administering the programs that are providing services, and to consider requirements other than just a minimum age and having a GED. Continuing education requirements would ensure that administrators are staying up to date with the industry.

Rep. Lee asked if there are any people operating these facilities now who have just gone up, since it sounds like there is some sort of seniority system. **Mr. Kemp** said there are people who are hired "off the street" to be an administrator.

Rep. Fuchs asked **Mr. Kemp** to give an example of the kind of person that we've been talking about in an inappropriate placement. **Mr. Kemp** said a level "B" facility requires nursing services in whatever capacity that the "B" client needs. The legislation was intended to allow an individual to age in place and not have to move to a different level facility. As a person ages and requires more services, the complexity of care requires a greater knowledge

base, and some licensed R.N.'s can only perform certain services. Without the proper knowledge and training, a person might not be able to correctly determine and assess whether a client had to be placed in or be moved to a facility with a higher level of care.

Rep. Fuchs asked what type of person requires an assisted living facility. **Mr. Kemp** said it is for a person who needs a little help in the activities of daily living but is basically highly functional. Sooner or later they will decline and will require some nursing services. At that point they become a "B" client, requiring supervision and nursing care and are non-ambulatory, sometimes experiencing dementia, and the facility must be able to recognize that.

Rep. Facey asked what the standards would be that administrators would have to meet. **Mr. Kemp** said there are three modules that would cover all of the basic programs, including basic management, human services, human resources, staff development, daily operational procedures, standards of resident care, physical environment, recreational activities and others.

Rep. Rice asked about the additional costs and what would be involved. **Mr. Kemp** said it would be a one-time fee of \$365 for the test. **Rep. Rice** asked who would absorb the cost of the continuing education. **Mr. Kemp** said the administrator would be the only person required to obtain continuing education, and the level would be established by rule.

Rep. Esp asked if there would be qualifications other than to pass the test. **Mr. Kemp** said that nursing home administrators pass a number of stringent examinations, and the basic elements of this study are in their examinations. A nursing home administrator would not need to be requalified under this, which is a lesser standard.

Rep. Ripley asked why the department wouldn't go through the rule-making process rather than law, other than the anticipation of some opposition. **Mr. Kemp** said the legislature meets only every two years, and the opposition to an administrative rule can be minimal or very extensive. He would anticipate that a number of individuals who are currently working under the existing rule, requiring a person to be age 18 and have a GED, who might object to going through more stringent requirements. There may be objections to the additional cost of \$365.

Rep. Noennig asked for clarification of any proposed rules whether or not this bill is passed and what additional requirements would be imposed. **Mr. Kemp** said an age factor isn't as important as an ability to comprehend basic management requirements. **Rep. Noennig** asked if they could elevate the requirements by rule whether or not the bill passed. **Mr. Kemp** said that is correct. **Rep. Noennig** asked

if it is correct that the proposed regulation would have a better chance of prevailing if they had statutory authority which appeared to broaden their rule-making authority. **Mr. Kemp** said that is correct.

Rep. Schmidt asked for assurance that there are definite guidelines or rules for the persons who are running personal care facilities. **Mr. Kemp** said that is in place and he would provide copies of the administrative rules for the committee if they wish. **{Tape : 2; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 0 - 25.1}**

Closing by Sponsor:

Rep. Thomas said that his mother-in-law was in progressive nursing home care for 11 years, moving from a retirement home to a personal care facility to a nursing home. As a person progresses, their loved ones do not want them to have to move to another level of care. It would be preferable to stay in one facility as long as possible. This bill addresses that and protects a person as they move from one step of care to another. It gives the nursing homes guidance and training. This is good legislation. **{Tape : 2; Side : B; Approx. Time Counter : 25.3 - 27.1}**

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 5:20 P.M.

REP. BILL THOMAS, Chairman

PATI O'REILLY, Secretary

BT/PO/JB

Transcribed by Jan Brown

EXHIBIT (huh05aad)